

### REMARKS

The Examiner objected to claim 1 as being indefinite. Claim 1 has been modified to make it definite.

The Examiner objected to claim 2, 5, 6, 18 and 19 as being vague and indefinite. Claims 2, 5, 6, 18 and 19 have been modified to make them definite.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 7, 8 and 15 under U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stahl (5,388,021). This rejection is respectfully traversed. The examiner misinterpreted the claims, which have been amended to make them clearer.

Stahl does not teach: "...a first coil and a second coil disposed in close proximity to one another, the first coil having a first winding, the second coil having a second winding, the first and second windings placed at an angle to one another..." Stahl does not teach any particular relationship between the windings of the individual inductors (coils) in the disclosed surge suppression circuit. Applicant's invention teaches a first coil and a second coil disposed in close proximity to one another and the windings of each are at an angle to each other, providing improved surge protection and thermal characteristics not disclosed in the Stahl patent. The Stahl patent teaches the parallel and series connection of discrete inductors (coils). For example, column 6, line 51

LARSON & LARSON,  
ATTORNEYS  
AT  
LAW

11199-69th STREET N.  
LARGO, FL 33773-5504  
PH. 727-546-0660  
FAX 727-545-1595

states: "...across inductors 23, 24, 33 and 34..." Before the present invention, inductors were known in the art as either an air-wound coil or a coil wound upon a core having two leads. An example of this type of inductor is a 1uH inductor with axial leads, part number 2474-01L, from API Delevan, Inc. Stahl fails to teach every element of the applicant's claim 1 or 15 as required in 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in order to support a rejection under this statute. Therefore, the Stahl patent does not teach claims 1 and 15. Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and claim 8 depends from claim 7. Claim 1 has been shown to not be taught by Stahl; therefore, claims 7 and 8 are not taught by Stahl.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 & 20 under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stahl (US 5,388,021) in view of Totsuka et al. (US 5,061,891). This rejection is respectively traversed. The examiner misinterpreted the claims, which have been amended to make them clearer. Stahl does not teach: "...a first coil and a second coil disposed in close proximity to one another, the first coil having a first winding, the second coil having a second winding, the first and second windings placed at an angle to one another..." Stahl does not teach any particular relationship between the windings of the individual inductors (coils) in the disclosed surge suppression circuit. The Stahl patent teaches the parallel and series connection of discrete

LARSON & LARSON,  
ATTORNEYS  
AT  
LAW

11199-69th STREET N.  
LARGO, FL 33773-5504  
PH. 727-546-0660  
FAX 727-545-1595

inductors (coils). For example, column 6, line 51 states: "...across inductors 23, 24, 33 and 34..." Before the present invention, inductors were known in the art as either an air-wound coil or a coil wound upon a core having two leads. An example of this type of inductor is a 1uH inductor with axial leads, part number 2474-01L, from API Delevan, Inc. Totsuka is limited to a cross coil for use in an indicator and does not suggest use of the cross coil in a surge suppressor. There is no suggestion in Totsuka that its device could be used in Stahl. Therefore, taking Stahl and Totsuka together and considering them as a whole do not make applicants claims 1 or 15 obvious within the meaning of U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 depend from claim 1 and claims 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 depend from claim 15. It follows that the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 21, 22 & 23 under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stahl (US 5,388,021) in view of Totsuka et al. (US 5,061,891) and Crosby et al. (US 4,876,713). This rejection is respectively traversed. The examiner misinterpreted the claims, which have been amended to make them clearer. As discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 15, Stahl does not teach: "...a first coil and a second coil disposed in close proximity to one another, the first coil having a first winding, the second coil

LARSON & LARSON,  
ATTORNEYS  
AT  
LAW

11199-69th STREET N.  
LARGO, FL 33773-5504  
PH. 727-546-0660  
FAX 727-545-1595

having a second winding, the first and second windings placed at an angle to one another..." Stahl does not teach any particular relationship between the windings of the individual inductors (coils) in the disclosed surge suppression circuit. The Stahl patent teaches the parallel and series connection of discrete inductors (coils). For example, column 6, line 51 states: "...across inductors 23, 24, 33 and 34..." Before the present invention, inductors were known in the art as either an air-wound coil or a coil wound upon a core having two leads. An example of this type of inductor is a 1uH inductor with axial leads, part number 2474-01L, from API Delevan, Inc. Totsuka is limited to a cross coil for use in an indicator and does not suggest use of the cross coil in a surge suppressor. Crosby teaches a surge protector with discrete inductors such as the inductors 87 and 88 of Crosby Fig. 7. Crosby does not teach any particular relationship between the windings of the discrete inductors (coils). There is no suggestion in Totsuka or Crosby that their device could be used in Stahl. Therefore, taking Stahl, Totsuka and Crosby together and considering them as a whole do not make applicants claims 10, 11, 12, 13 & 14 which depend from claim 1 or 21, 22 & 23 which depend from claim 15 obvious within the meaning of U.S.C. §103(a). It follows that the rejection should be withdrawn.

LARSON & LARSON,  
ATTORNEYS  
AT  
LAW

11199-69th STREET N.  
LARGO, FL 33773-5504  
PH. 727-546-0660  
FAX 727-545-1595

In view of all the above, it is believed that Claims 1-23 are now in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

*Frank Liebenow*

Frank Liebenow  
Registration No. 48,688  
Agent for Applicant  
*Larson & Larson, PA*  
11199 69<sup>th</sup> Street North  
Largo, FL 33773-5504  
(727) 546-0660

Customer No. 22497

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8**

I, Lynn A. Raffin, hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "First Class Mail" service under 37 C.F.R. §1.8 on the date indicated below in an envelope addressed to the **Commissioner for Patents, Mail Stop Amendment, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

Date: 11-17-05

*Lynn A. Raffin*  
LYNN A. RAFFIN

LARSON & LARSON,  
ATTORNEYS  
AT  
LAW

11199-69th STREET N.  
LARGO, FL 33773-5504  
PH. 727-546-0660  
FAX 727-545-1595